

May 13, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10059

woodlot over the demand of a growing town for more housing space or for a new highway right-of-way. But, much can be done to make certain that these demands for more and more space are truly justified and that proper planning has been carried out to assure maximum use of the land so diverted. We have seen countless examples of the clearing of excessive amounts of land to accommodate special single-purpose projects. Often, too, land is retained in a barren, unproductive condition long after the purpose for which it was cleared has been served. Certainly, such land can and must be returned to trees as rapidly as possible. Frequently, when someone cares enough to take a second look, alternative sites, which require little or no clearing of land, can be located.

A recent example of this is fresh in my mind. Last fall, just before the general election, it became known that plans were being made to route a tollway through the grounds of the Morton Arboretum. This would have had a disastrous effect on that lovely location. Immediately, conservation forces were mobilized, pressure was brought to bear on the planners and the idea, which presumably was advanced as being essential, was abandoned. Other means were found for handling that traffic.

Please do not misunderstand me on this point. I am not suggesting that our forest land be locked up and removed from use and enjoyment. This would not be conservation, which means wise use; it would be preservation, which means a static state. What I am suggesting is that trees and the land upon which they grow be used with great wisdom and restraint as befits a resource which, if properly utilized, can last forever, but which, if unwisely used, can be depleted to the loss and sorrow of all people.

We must realize that never again will land and forests be so plentiful that each special interest group can claim an area and do with it as it likes to satisfy its own needs and desires to the exclusion of all others. We will have to learn to apply the multiple-use concept, whereby, through enlightened planning and utilization, each acre of land produces its maximum number of benefits.

Land planted in trees, to be utilized as forest products must also provide cover for game and places of retreat for those who seek to recreate their spirits in communion with nature. By the same token, as the population expands and more people demand more products and benefits from the forest, fewer and fewer sections can be set aside exclusively for game and recreation.

As sites are cleared for the endless expansion of our cities, consideration must be given and steps taken so as to leave the maximum number of trees in their natural settings.

Forested watersheds must husband the source of water while producing tree crops and recreation.

Fortunately, by enlightened management and intelligent use, it is possible—and often best—for a given tract of land to provide multiple benefits. Public agencies and private interests should cooperate at every level to assure that multiple-use concepts are applied relentlessly.

At the same time, it must be realized that while some areas can produce multiple benefits, others are suited to yield only one type of benefit. Where these one-benefit areas exist, they should be managed with the same determination to provide the maximum of that one benefit.

Another remedy to the problem of trees and people is the same as the one advocated by J. Sterling Morton and symbolized by Arbor Day.

Currently, nearly 1 billion trees are planted each year in the United States on private and Government lands. In fact, during the period 1958 to 1975, nearly 19 million acres

of land will be planted to trees in an attempt to counteract some of the diversion. We can easily see how much more serious our plight would be without this planting and these new forests.

We must take every means to encourage the planting of trees and the conversion of barren lands to the growing of trees. This encouragement can come in the form of educational campaigns, assistance from private interests and favorable legislation and tax structures.

The people of the United States must have trees and forests, and they will have them. As it is with almost all of the challenges we face as a free people, this one will be solved either by the citizenry acting by its own choice to meet its material and spiritual needs and those of future generations; or, the decisions will be made through authoritative action by the several government agencies. It is my hope and belief that citizens, as individuals, and in groups, will face these facts we have considered today and act with the same devotion, energy, and intelligence shown by J. Sterling Morton.

I would like to close by quoting two paragraphs from a letter he wrote to the Omaha Daily Herald on the occasion of the first Arbor Day. He declared: "A collection of inanimate marbles may, for a few years, preserve the name, and entry, and exist on this stage in life's short play. But how much more enduring are the animate trees of our own planting. They grow and self-perpetuate themselves, and shed yearly blessings on our race. Trees are the monuments I would have."

Thus we come to a benediction on the institution of Arbor Day in Nebraska. May it become a joy forever, and its anniversary be perpetuated in the constantly increasing blessings which its faithful observance is absolutely certain to bestow." DR

U.S. GOVERNMENT ACTION IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, recently I had the opportunity to read a very fine editorial on the situation in the Dominican Republic which appeared in the Patriot, of Harrisburg, Pa. This statement points up the painful decision which the administration faced when confronted with this emergency and the sensible choice which President Johnson made.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot, May 4, 1965]

A PAINFUL DECISION BUT THE ALTERNATIVE WAS WORSE

The turmoil in the Dominican Republic has confronted the U.S. Government with the most painful kind of decision. Life would be a good deal simpler if right and wrong were always unmistakably clear, and decisions would be relatively painless if events would wait while clarity is being established.

But events don't wait. Most of the important decisions—and hence the hardest—involve the choice between the greater and the lesser evils, or between principles both of which are right but which come into conflict with themselves.

But choices must be made. As President Johnson pointed out in his Sunday evening speech, which was addressed as much to the people of Latin America as to the people of the United States, not to choose is itself a form of choice. If the U.S. Government had stayed its hand and let events sort them-

selves out as they would, this country would in effect have been making the choice to let the carnage continue, with the lives of thousands of American and foreign citizens at stake. And we would, further, have been taking the chance that out of the blood and bitterness in the Dominican Republic the Communists would have ended up in control. The United States could not and would not take that chance.

There has been some grumbling in Latin America, quite natural in view of past history, about unilateral "Yanqui" intervention into the affairs of a sovereign state. Yet it must be said that the criticism has not been as great as the Johnson administration feared it might be. Latin Americans are sensitive to "gunboat diplomacy," but they are sophisticated enough to understand that their own interests are involved when Castro-supported forces seek to overthrow a Western Hemisphere government.

It is quite true that the Charter of the Organization of American States declares that "the territory of the States is inviolable; it may not be the object, even temporarily, of military occupation or of other measures of force taken by another State, directly or indirectly, on any grounds whatever."

It is also true, however, that—as President Johnson pointedly noted in his address—in January of 1962 the OAS declared: "The principles of communism are incompatible with the principles of the inter-American system."

The latter declaration would be a dead letter if nothing were done to implement it. And the inviolability of hemispheric territory cannot be one sided. If, as the administration asserts, outside forces intervened in the Dominican Republic to establish a Castro-type regime, the United States would be remiss in its responsibilities to the Dominican people, to the inter-American system and to itself if it did nothing.

This is not, however, and should not be a one-nation show. The OAS met in response to a U.S. request and has sent a five-nation mission to Santo Domingo to help stop the fighting. The United States also is requesting OAS members to provide military forces of their own for what is a necessary but what must be a temporary occupation. We hope they will comply. Responsibilities for maintaining peace and democratic governments in the Western Hemisphere belong to all members of the OAS, and if present machinery does not work adequately better machinery must be devised.

NOMINATION OF CHARLES S. MURPHY TO BE CHAIRMAN OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, Charles S. Murphy, Under Secretary of Agriculture, has been nominated by President Lyndon Johnson to assume the chairmanship of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

I have worked with Under Secretary Murphy on a number of vital and complex problems. I have found him at all times to be an objective and fair administrator. His judgments reflected due consideration of all factors involved. His decisions were just and equitable. It cannot be doubted but that he evaluates all matters on their merits.

Under Secretary Murphy is a highly competent, well qualified, and dedicated public servant. His services and contributions to agriculture have been many and varied.

I recommend him for his exemplary performance of duty in the Department of Agriculture. I am certain that, after confirmation by the Senate, he will con-

10060

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 13, 1965

tinue to contribute greatly to the national interest in his new assignment.

VERMONT LEGISLATURE OPPOSES POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT'S PROPOSAL TO CURTAIL RAILROAD SERVICE INTO NORTHERN VERMONT

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the subject of railway mail service is of deep concern to the people of Vermont. Hundreds of my constituents have written and spoken to me about the plan of the Post Office Department to truck the mail into northern Vermont. They are opposed to this plan, because of the hardships that would result from the loss of employment by several employees, and the resultant curtailment of passenger service.

The feeling that this plan would be a detriment to the economy of the area and to the efficiency of the mail is reflected in the recent action of the General Assembly of the State of Vermont in unanimously adopting Joint Senate Resolution 12.

I congratulate the general assembly, and hope this expression of sentiment will help alert the Senate to the feelings of Vermonters on the proposal of the Post Office Department.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Vermont General Assembly's Joint Senate Resolution 12.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 12

Joint resolution relating to retention of railway mail service between St. Albans and White River Junction and return

Whereas by recent pronouncement, the U.S. Post Office Department has indicated its intention to prohibit the carriage of mail by railway train service between St. Albans and White River Junction and return, commencing as of July 1, 1965; and

Whereas the implementation of such policy by the U.S. Post Office Department would result in the loss of substantial revenue by the Central Vermont Railway, would result in the loss of employment by several long-time employees of said Central Vermont Railway, and would result in the possible curtailment of railway passenger service furnished by Central Vermont Railway between St. Albans and White River Junction and return; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the General Assembly of the State of Vermont does hereby register its opposition to the proposed order of the U.S. Post Office Department prohibiting the carriage of mail by railway train service between St. Albans and White River Junction and return, and does strongly urge the Vermont congressional delegation to voice such opposition to the proper Government officials; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state send a copy of this resolution to Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY, and Congressman ROBERT T. STAFFORD and the Honorable John A. Gronouski, Postmaster General of the United States.

Approved May 3, 1965.

PHILIP H. HOFF,

Governor.

JOHN J. DALEY,

President of the Senate.

FRANKLIN S. BILLINGS, Jr.,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PATRIOTISM IS NOT DEAD

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, in this day when patriotism and love of country are considered unsophisticated and passe by many Americans I am heartened by recent expressions of three Utahans who were recently selected recipients of Freedom Foundation Awards. They are: Raymond Takashi Swenson, Robert B. Fox, and David Van DeGraff.

Their essays are particularly refreshing coming at a time when many of the counterparts of these award winners who likewise enjoy the advantages of American citizenship have taken it upon themselves to picket the White House and to decry our policies designed to protect the people of southeast Asia and generally refusing to serve their country in the preservation of freedom.

On the basis that these essays will have widespread interest, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY I LOVE AMERICA

(By David Van DeGraff)

I don't know why exactly, except when I really start to think about it, I get a strange feeling deep inside my chest. I feel the same way at pack meeting when we have the flag ceremony. I'm really proud to be an American.

I'm proud to be a Cub Scout, too, because I'm learning how to get along with other people and to play fair. And that's why I love America. I know if I do my best and play square that I can be anything I want to be.

I can curl up in my warm bed at night and feel safe, because if America was ever threatened by anyone or anything I know that I and all my friends would stick together and fight to keep our country safe.

WHAT IT MEANS TO ME TO BE A CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(By Raymond Takashi Swenson)

Fumie Suzuki, a Japanese citizen during the Second World War, lived in a small home in Nagoya with her parents and their five other children. They lived in constant fear of dying, either from lack of food or from the American bombs which had such devastating effects. This dread was heightened especially near the end of the conflict. They were fortunate when they could secure a few grains of the tough brown rice, sometimes the only food available. Her father, an air raid warden, was also fortunate when he was able to return to his family after the bombings.

This woman is my mother. She decided to take the road to American citizenship for her family's welfare. Naturalization allowed her, after living in this country 3 years and taking an oath of allegiance, to become a citizen of the greatest land on earth.

Other aliens had different reasons for becoming citizens, but there is one major one which envelopes all the rest, that can be described in one word: "opportunity." They wanted an opportunity to become rich, an opportunity to make a farm out of wasteland, an opportunity to pursue their chosen profession, an opportunity to worship as they wished, or an opportunity to raise a family in any way they saw fit, and many, ever so many more reasons.

If I had a list of those things dear to me, my mother and my citizenship would head the list. One reason for this is that citizenship is dear to my mother, and thus becomes valuable to me. But there is certainly much

more to it than that. It means something to me to live here, belonging to a group of people who, for the most part, defend the principles upon which our Government is founded.

I won't go into idealism and politics. It has little meaning for me to do so yet, for I cannot hold public office, I cannot vote, and I am not qualified to compare societies with other countries. But I can say that these things affect me even now, and I should therefore make an effort to learn more about them, for that reason and also the one of preparing myself to take up these adult privileges and responsibilities.

But what does citizenship mean to me? It means that I can kneel at any time and pray, in my own way, to God. It means that no person, be he pauper or President, can force his beliefs upon me; nor can I force mine upon him.

It means that I can salute the flag of the United States, pledging anew my allegiance to it and the freedoms and principles it stands for.

It means that I can join the Boy Scouts or any other organization that develops my personality and does not limit other peoples' freedoms.

It means that I can have an education, unrestrained by social classes, religious, or other discrimination, and continuing as long as I am willing to work for it.

It means that I can travel anywhere in this broad land without the sanction of the Government. I need no passport or visa in order to vacation in California or visit Wyoming.

It means that I have an opportunity to grow into an intelligent, moral human being.

Most of all, it means that I'm recognized as a separate, thinking individual. I am, as are my fellow men, considered a person, with individual thoughts, individual emotions, individual actions, but possessing rights equal to those of every other citizen. You and I, everyone, is considered separate but equal under the law. Our lives are guided and built upon guarantees made to us by the Federal Republic we live under, assurances that we can pray to God, salute the flag, complete an education, and mature into responsible adults. But, above all, I have the assurance that I will be recognized and appreciated as a thinking individual by my fellows, by my elders, and by my Government.

REFLECTIONS WHILE STANDING BEFORE THE LINCOLN MEMORIAL

(By Robert Fox)

When gazing upon the statue of this great man Abraham Lincoln, my thoughts first go back hundreds of years to the man whose name he bears, that man being father Abraham, well known in the literature of the Bible. Abraham of ancient times became the father of many nations. He was chosen by the Lord to be a pillar of strength and a leader among his people. What better name could have been given to one of the fathers and stalwarts in the history of this blessed land of America.

The stone facsimile of this man commands respect and reverence while in its presence because the likeness reminds one of the flesh and blood man, the man who rose from a humble, backwoods, log cabin beginning to the leader of a powerful nation, without himself losing his humility. He never became too great to honor and love the woman who gave him birth. "All I am or ever hope to be, I owe to my sainted mother."

This man who reached the top, the pinnacle of success among businessmen, politicians and people in so-called high places, did not for once forget the common man, for he too liked to be numbered as one. "Whatever is calculated to improve the condition of the honest, struggling laboring man, I am for that thing." He not only preached for the

May 13, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2383

pleasing personality, his sincerity, tact and friendliness, has endeared him to his associates: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Texas Veterans Affairs Commission does hereby go on record to commend Glyndon M. Hague for the significant contribution he has made toward our mutual goal of rendering a real and tangible service to Texas veterans and their dependents; and be it further

"Resolved, That the members of the veterans affairs commission acknowledge with profound appreciation the cooperation and assistance that Mr. Hague has extended to this commission, and by this resolution, recognizes and pays tribute to Glyndon M. Hague for his active interest and understanding of veterans' problems and welfare, and direct that a copy of this resolution be presented to him.

"In official recognition whereof, we hereby affix our signatures this 4th day of May 1965.

"JOHN E. MCKELVEY,
"Chairman.
"CHARLES L. MORRIS,
"Executive Director."

Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, with permission I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House the following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 2, 1965, concerning the situation in the Dominican Republic:

INTERVENING FOR FREEDOM

In announcing the Soviet call for a Security Council meeting on the U.S. Dominican intervention, Tass yesterday echoed the cries of the anti-Yanqui, of the automatic anti-interventionist, of Castro and his acolytes, and also of many an American who, nose buried in the history of an earlier era, was quick last week to shout "gunboat diplomacy."

According to Tass, the marine landing was "yet another attempt to keep in power a reactionary, an antipopular dictatorship regime, which suits the United States of America, and to suppress the stirrings of the people for freedom and independence." * * There can be no justification for the invasion of the territory of a sovereign state by the American Armed Forces."

The charge of "gunboat diplomacy" is, in the common pejorative sense of the phrase, as unjustified in this instance as the gunboats of old are obsolete and as the Tass charge is false. True, American Armed Forces landed on a neighbor nation's shores. True, the protection of U.S. and other foreign lives seems to have been more an excuse than a reason, a device designed to give juridical legitimacy to move made for reasons of high policy. But what matters most in this case is the purpose and the context.

The purpose was not to grab territory, to extend U.S. influence or to install a Latin-American dictator of our choosing. We have no right and no reason to intervene or to take sides in a clash between those who favor the restoration of President Bosch and those headed by Gen. Wessin y Wessin, who oppose it. The record proves that we supported Dr. Bosch during the time he was in office and that we demonstrated our

strong disapproval of those, including General Wessin y Wessin, who overthrew him.

We do, however, have a duty to ourselves, to other American Republics, and even to the Dominican people to take precautionary measures which might prevent a group of Communists from exploiting chaos to repeat what happened in Cuba. If that was undertaken unilaterally by the United States, it was not by choice but by necessity. It was due to the failure of the Organization of American States, following the Castro betrayal, to create an inter-American force which might act swiftly to deal with such an emergency as arose in the Dominican Republic.

Latin-American governments instinctively rush to the nonintervention article 17 of the OAS Charter whenever they fear the "colossus of the North" is overstepping itself in hemisphere affairs. But this time, while citing the article, they have been strikingly moderate and reserved in their reaction.

The reason must be that many, at least, understand and sympathize with the purpose of President Johnson's action, and recognize that Castro has introduced a new element that requires new responses. Through his betrayal of his own revolution, followed by his persistent campaign to organize—and subvert—revolutions in other countries, Castro has made revolution in Latin America an international exercise. Whatever its trappings, a Castro-inspired revolt is not a domestic product. To be effective as an organization for the common defense, the OAS has to devise means to prevent the new-style Havana-directed burrowing under national boundaries, as well as the old-style crossing over them.

President Johnson has sought diligently to prod the OAS into converting the unilateral American intervention into a multilateral OAS intervention. This, if successful, could be the first step toward creation of a permanent force that would make future unilateral action unnecessary. It should be.

Meanwhile, conditions have to be established in the Dominican Republic which will enable its sorely tried people to walk the streets in safety, and to choose their own government—without fear that they are being delivered into the hands of a secretly plotted tyranny, a tyranny which the Soviets, who so piously protested to the U.N., would dearly like to see imposed.

Fabulous Fourth Questionnaire

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, in March of this year I mailed my second annual questionnaire to over 100,000 constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of New York.

My first questionnaire last year elicited an enthusiastic response and requests for more, and I promised to make this procedure an annual one. Through it I learn the thinking of those who live in the "Fabulous Fourth" Congressional District and I keep abreast of public opinion. Although its printing is expensive, it is well worth the cost to me.

Returns are still coming in at a rate which indicates we will surpass the unusually high number of 14,000 replies received last year.

There is no politics in this questionnaire. It is sent to all registered voters regardless of party.

The results were independently compiled by Date Management, Inc. of Washington, D.C.

Of the 11 questions asked only one received a "no" vote and that was on admitting Red China to the U.N. There was an overwhelming 73.7 percent against this.

All the other questions received "yes" votes, the most emphatic being in favor of withholding voting rights from U.N. members who do not pay dues—89.7 percent—and the next in favor of prayer in public schools—81.1 percent.

The largest uncertain vote concerned American policy in Vietnam—14.6 percent—and the smallest on prayer in schools—3.1 percent.

However, 54.9 percent of those answering favored continued participation in the war in South Vietnam using present methods.

The deepest splits developed on the issues of medicare—46.5 to 44 percent—and Federal aid to private and parochial schools—44.6 to 49.6 percent.

Support for my bill, H.R. 2488, to give tax credits to parents paying tuition—70.2 percent in favor this year as compared to 72.3 percent last year.

The most interesting and unique result was on the personal choice of a political philosophy. Most persons described themselves as politically moderate—43.7 percent. Conservative was selected by 28.8 percent and liberal by 20.1 percent. The balance indicated no preference.

The growing response and fact that more than half of the questionnaires returned contained individual comments shows that the people of the "Fabulous Fourth" Congressional District do care about their government.

On May 13 of last year, I gave the benefit of this combined thinking of our district to my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

As promised, I now do this again this year—and on the same day—May 13—and I will mail these results to all who live in the Fourth Congressional District.

My thanks and congratulations to those who participated and made this questionnaire a success. You have assured its continuation next year.

The questionnaire follows:

FABULOUS FOURTH QUESTIONNAIRE
FOREIGN POLICY

1. Do you favor participation of Red China in the U.N.? Yes, 17.5; no, 73.7; undecided, 8.8.

2. Do you favor continued participation in the war in South Vietnam using present methods? Yes, 54.9; no, 30.5; undecided, 14.6.

3. Do you favor withholding voting rights from U.N. members who do not pay their dues? Yes, 89.7; no, 4.8; undecided, 5.5.

4. Do you favor further Federal legislation to enforce the right to vote? Yes, 66.1; no, 26.4; undecided, 7.5.

5. Do you favor the 35-hour week? Yes, 46.3; no, 42.0; undecided, 11.7.

HOMEFRONT POLICY

6. Do you favor allowing a voluntary non-denominational prayer to be recited in pub-

A2384

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 13, 1965

lic schools? Yes, 81.1; no, 15.8; undecided, 3.1.

7. Do you favor inclusion of private and parochial schools in Federal aid-to-education programs? Yes, 44.6; no, 49.6; undecided, 5.8.

8. Do you favor tax credits for parents who pay tuition for their children attending school? Yes, 70.2; no, 24.3; undecided, 5.5.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND TAXES

9. Do you favor hospital care for those over 65, paid for by an increased social security tax? Yes, 46.5; no, 44.0; undecided, 9.5.

10. Do you favor a reduction in spending to produce a balanced Federal budget? Yes, 72.2; no, 16.8; undecided, 11.9.

GENERAL PHILOSOPHY

(This question is optional. An answer is not required.)

11. Do you favor a philosophy of government that is: conservative? 28.8; moderate? 43.7; liberal? 20.1.

A Personal Report: The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I inserted in the RECORD the first portion of an outstanding analysis of education in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics written by William Benton, former Senator from the State of Connecticut, former Assistant Secretary of State and now serving as Ambassador to UNESCO.

Today, with permission, I would like to continue this series, which was first published in the Encyclopedia Britannica's Yearbook for 1965.

A PERSONAL REPORT: THE TEACHERS AND THE TAUGHT IN THE U.S.S.R.

(By William Benton, former Assistant Secretary of State and U.S. Senator; presently U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO and U.S. member of its executive board; publisher and chairman, Encyclopedia Britannica)

CHAPTER I—A QUICK OVERVIEW OF THE CHALLENGE OF SOVIET EDUCATION

Education is at the very core of the Communist system.

To the question, "Is Soviet education any good?" I must reply, "Yes, it is good—it is very good indeed, and it is getting better—for the purposes of communism." Education in the Soviet Union is the major instrument of national policy. It commands the vigorous support of all Soviet leaders—Leninist, Stalinist, Khrushchevist, and post-Khrushchevist.

"A point of honor and a patriotic duty with Soviet scientists," said Nikita Khrushchev at the 22d meeting of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1962 (and his successors are pledged to the resolutions of that meeting), "is to establish Soviet science in a preeminent position in the most important branches of knowledge and to occupy the foremost position in the world in all fields of science." Toward this goal, scientific education in the Soviet Union is making rapid and effective strides.

I have reported this before. So have others. After my first trip to the U.S.S.R., in 1955, I wrote and spoke at length about it. As early as May 1956, I said in an address before the National Association of State Universities in New York:

"I fear the Communists may have found a formula for combining on the one hand high quality in scientific and technological training and research—including production of original and creative work in the natural sciences—and on the other hand acceptance and obedience in political, economic, philosophical, and moral matters. Whether this formula will hold up over the decades may turn out to be the crucial question of our historic epoch. Allen Dulles, head of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, expresses 'cautious hope' that it won't. I want to share this hope; but I must honestly report that I have found no concrete evidence to sustain it."

When the Soviet Union launched the first sputnik, on October 4, 1957, most people in the United States were startled. They hadn't remotely suspected that the Soviet Union had developed scientists knowledgeable enough, and in command of enough skills and resources, to accomplish such a spectacular breakthrough. The sputnik impelled me to write a book enlarging on my observations of 1955. Published in 1958, "This Is the Challenge" dealt with the gauntlet the Soviets had hurled at American education. My views have subsequently been corroborated many times. Lawrence G. Derthick, U.S. Commissioner of Education, in 1958 headed a delegation of 10 leading U.S. educators to inspect Soviet education. He told the National Press Club in Washington, D.C.:

"What we have seen has amazed us in one outstanding particular; we were simply not prepared for the degree to which the U.S.S.R., as a nation, is committed to education as a means of national advancement. Everywhere we went we saw indication after indication of what we could only conclude amounted to total commitment to education. Our major reaction therefore is one of astonishment—and I choose the word carefully—at the extent to which this seems to have been accomplished. For what it is worth, 10 American educators came away sobered by what they saw."

The reappraisal of science education within the United States following the sputnik largely contributed to the passage by Congress of the National Defense Education Act of 1958—and to its amendment and extension in 1964 for another 3 years.

The sputnik detonated a barrage of criticism and condemnation of educators and educational practices in the United States. Some of this criticism was constructive. Much of it was aimed at the wrong targets. However, it seems ironic that a Soviet scientific and technical success was required to galvanize public interest in our American schools.

The sputnik may help illustrate how ignorance of Communist purposes, and of Communism's abilities and successes, can help blind us to the task of improving American education. We should not wait for such external stimuli as the sputnik. I fear that unless American education is infused with new fervor from within our own society, unless it is stimulated by our own extensive research and by experimentation in new methods, unless it is reinforced through a renewed love of both teaching and learning, and buttressed by a larger proportion of the national income—we may wake up to find ourselves outwitted and outdistanced by the U.S.S.R. around the globe.

This does not mean that at its best, and for a limited number of students, the present quality of education in the United States is surpassed in any country; and quantitatively—in the numbers of people to whom educational opportunity is afforded—our statistics rank among the highest in the world. But it is precisely this record that the Soviet Union is now challenging with sensational success. The challenge, although we didn't recognize it, was launched as far back as the late 1920's when Soviet education began to be honored and promoted as

the key to Communist progress and ultimate victory.

M. M. Deineko's "Forty Years of Public Education in the U.S.S.R." (Moscow, 1957) records that: "The right of citizens to education is guaranteed by the Soviet Constitution (art. 121) and is ensured by various state measures: universal, compulsory 7-year education for children of school age in their native language, extensive development of secondary education, free tuition in all types of educational establishments, payment of state stipends to students, and provision of free technical and agronomic training in factories, on state and collective farms and at machine and tractor stations."

In August 1964 a report on "Recent Trends in Soviet Scientific and Technical Education" was released by the Committee on Education and Labor of the U.S. House of Representatives. It was presented by Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana, who in his letter of transmittal summed up its highlights as follows:

1. Top Soviet leaders, including Chairman Khrushchev, have made strong pronouncements during the last couple of years that they intend [the U.S.S.R.] to be the world leader in science.

2. The Soviets have doubled their graduate enrollments during the last 4 years, with heavy emphasis on science and engineering.

3. They have doubled their scientific research budget during the last 4 years.

4. They are continuing to graduate three times as many engineers as we are. For each engineer they plan to train 3 or 4 technicians.

5. Their present 20-year plan, extending to 1980, envisions tremendous expansion in science, technology, and education, with manyfold increase in productivity in certain branches of the national economy.

6. A number of American leaders who are qualified to speak on the subject rate certain aspects of Soviet higher education and their science and technology very highly."

Thus Soviet leaders continue to drive toward their educational goals within the limitations of their social order and human fallibility. To be sure, to them the word education has a meaning that is different from the generally accepted meaning of the word in the United States. Education in the Soviet Union is always in part admonition to serve the Communist cause; often it involves what to us is a distortion of history. Never does it stress the benefits to the individual, as we do, but always the benefits to the State. But rarely, if ever, is it a distortion of science. With occasional exceptions in one or two fields, Soviet scientific researchers are as precise, as probing and as curious as any in the world. For example, mathematics and all the physical sciences remain free of political bias. The theories of the biologist Lysenko, supported by Stalin and other political leaders but laughed at by Western scientists, have recently been discredited and withdrawn.

In substance, however, the Communist Party is itself the most effective educational force in the Nation. To us, this is impossible to imagine. We cannot conceive a political party in the United States playing a similar role even if one party were in permanent control of all branches of our Government. In the U.S.S.R., the Communist Party is the central source of power; it is itself the all-powerful government; it is above all an integrated political, economic, and social system, all in one package. Further, it demands complete and unswerving devotion from Soviet citizen. Thus, inevitably, it is an educational system as well. As education has become the lifeblood of communism, the Communist Party's support of its type of education must be total.

Quite a different goal for education always has been an integral part of the American dream. America has dreamed of producing supreme individuals, not the su-